

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this

Amendment, no claims were amended, added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remain at issue.

I. Double Patenting Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-19 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of copending Application No. 10/030,857. Application No. 10/030,857 was filed on April 29, 2002, after the filing date of the present invention. Because this provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the present, earlier filed application, and later-filed Application No. 10/030,857 is rejectionable on other grounds, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection without a terminal disclaimer. (See MPEP § 1490).


Claims 1-19 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14, 20, 31, and 37-50 of copending Application No. 10/398,538. Application No. 10/398,538 was filed on July 23, 2003, after the filing date of the present invention. Because this provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the present, earlier filed application, and later-filed Application No. 10/398,538 is rejectionable on other grounds, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection without a terminal disclaimer. (See MPEP § 1490).

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 15, 2005

By: 
Marina N. Saito
Registration No. 42,121
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000